

**OLD VILLAGE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MEETING NOTICE
February 12, 2018 at 5:00pm
Town Hall Committee Meeting Room
Floor 3, Room 3300
100 Ann Edwards Lane · Mount Pleasant, SC 29464**

NOTE: Items in [blue](#) are hyperlinks (some file sizes are large and may take a minute to load).

MINUTES

PRESENT: Scott Hirshorn, Chair; Heather Wilson, Vice Chair;
Leigh Rowe, Louisa Montgomery and Ann Dovre

STAFF PRESENT: Eric Pohlman, Senior Planner; Joe Juan; Plan
Reviewer

Mr. Hirshorn called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and introduced himself as the new Chairman of the Commission. He also introduced the new Vice Chair, Heather Wilson and two new Commission members, Louisa Montgomery and Ann Dovre. Mr. Hirshorn reviewed the meeting procedures with the public.

I. Approval of Minutes - [January 8, 2018](#)

Ms. Wilson moved for approval of the January 8, 2018 minutes; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

II. Public Comment & General Correspondence – prudent to request guidance

a. Discussion of adding temporary handicap/ADA access to Staff Level Review List

Mr. Pohlman stated that this is in response to public correspondence he received via telephone regarding addition of temporary handicap and/or ADA accessibility to both historic and non-historic homes. He stated with

the aging population of the Historic District, he felt it was prudent to request guidance from the Commission and request the ability to draft up additional guidelines, as well as add temporary handicap and ADA accessibility to staff level reviews for both historic and non-historic structures. He said since historic structures will be added, he is seeking guidance on drafting up guidelines.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that this is a good precedent with the handicap access ramps needing to be constructed quickly from time to time. He said that he would like to investigate if there are guidelines that should be imposed on what the materials should be, or if they should be temporary in nature. He said this is for a staff level approval, so the homeowners do not have to come before the Commission. He said that the Commission should devise some general guidelines on the ramps.

Ms. Montgomery stated that having had the opportunity to make use of a ramp, they had a metal ramp installed, because it was going to be temporary and was a rental situation paid by their insurance. She said the wooden ramps are more attractive and preferable if it is going to be a permanent installation. She said staff should have the ability to handle this situation. She said in some cases, it may eliminate one of the parking places and each residence is required to have 2 parking spaces. She said in view of the fact that it will be used for a handicap ramp, she feels there should be an exception.

Ms. Rowe stated that she agrees with Ms. Montgomery's comments. She said if the rental could be approved temporarily until the homeowner is able to come before the Commission, this would be acceptable.

Ms. Montgomery stated that it is expensive to have a handicap ramp installed, so the structure needs to be in use permanently or temporarily.

Ms. Wilson asked what was generating this discussion.

Mr. Pohlman stated that residents called into the Town with concerns about the process to have a handicap ramp approved. They felt that it should be done at staff level, so the response is more timely. They were concerned that the ramp that was approved in January was going to be on February's meeting agenda, not January's. There was concern that it would take an additional month for approval.

Ms. Wilson stated that she has some concern, because she understands how it may become an immediate issue, but it could also be a structure that lasts for 20 or 30 years. She said if Commission members agree to have staff level approval on this issue, she feels that guidelines need to be written by Commission members on what materials are acceptable, how it is buffered and other elements. She said she is not comfortable with it being purely a staff level decision without guidelines.

Mr. Pohlman said this is why he had the homeowners apply for the alteration.

Ms. Wilson asked about the process to write the guidelines.

Mr. Pohlman said that Commission members may send their guideline suggestions to him and he will compile them for discussion at the next Commission meeting. He said if Commission members feel they are appropriate, he will post them to the Town's website for thirty days and they may be voted on at the April 9, 2018 Commission meeting. If approved, they will become part of the guidelines.

Ms. Montgomery asked about the process if a homeowner needed a handicap ramp next week.

Mr. Pohlman said they would be required to apply for an alteration to their stairs and if it is a historic structure, they would be required to come before the Commission in March.

Ms. Dovre stated that if necessary, it needs to be done; however, the appearance of the ramp needs to be in the guidelines.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that an acceptable compromise would be to have the guidelines stipulate that the handicap ramp is temporary and if the homeowner requires a permanent structure, they would need to come before the full Commission with specifics on the materials and the appearance of the temporary ramp. He stated that Commission members will send in their suggestions and return for discussions in March.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she was previously confined to her home with a handicapped individual for two weeks without a ramp. She said that the metal ramps are not attractive; however, safety is primary. She said to remember when writing the guidelines, that safety of the ramp is more important than the appearance.

III. BUSINESS

Ms. Rowe made a consent motion for item #2, 409 Royall Avenue and #9, 221 Queen Street.

Ms. Wilson stated that she would like to hear item #9, 221 Queen Street, as she needs more clarity.

Ms. Rowe amended her motion for consent on item #2, 409 Royall Avenue; seconded by Ms. Wilson. All present voted in favor.

STAFF REPORT

1. [108 Carr Street](#) – Survey 6269 – (TMS 532-05-00-057) Final Review for Accessory Structure and Addition

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to move this item to the end of the list; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

2. [409 Royall Avenue](#) – Survey 5997 – (TMS 532-05-00-064) Final Review for Alterations to Driveway

[Consent Motion]

3. [311 Venning Street](#) – Survey 6187.01 – (TMS 532-01-00-264) Conceptual Comment for Altering Accessory Structure into Accessory Dwelling Unit

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Mr. Pohlman stated that staff also received four email correspondence today regarding 311 Venning Street and asked Mr. Hirshorn to propose an agenda amendment to accept the correspondence.

Mr. Hirshorn moved to amend the agenda; seconded by Ms. Wilson. All present voted in favor.

Julie O'Connor, designer for 311 Venning Street, stated that they received a zoning variance for the BAR ratio increase. She said currently the property has a 65% building area ratio and they are requesting an increase of 3.5% with the addition of the half-story. The property has a peculiar zoning of R3 as opposed to R2, which most of the properties in the Old Village have. She said the owners made special note that the main reason why they requested the increase was because of the improvement of the appearance of the structure. She said the homeowners felt that the

addition would make the structure more harmonious with the character of the prevailing architecture of the district and the block. She is proposing a half-story to the existing non-historic garage which is at the back of the property and are meeting the 20 foot height restriction and have been cautious to follow the guidelines, with regards to adding dormers to accessory structures and feel that it is an improvement to the appearance of the existing building. The purpose of the renovation is to have a kick out space for the minor children for a playroom and add a guest suite to the property for guest space. She said they have brought on Glenn Gardner, landscape architect, and will have him provide additional details on the landscape and hardscape that is being proposed. She said in general, they are slightly reducing the amount of impervious lot coverage on the property. She said that they will also be working on the drainage situation, because it slopes from the street to the back of the property. She said that the drainage issues are part of the renovation, and in fact, the impetus for much of the work. She said another small portion of this project is that they would like to rework the non-historic stairs that are coming off the back of the piazza on the main house and provide more space between the existing garage and the house.

Ms. Montgomery asked if there has been an issue with the water going into Hardware Alley and if the land behind the house was all gravel.

Ms. O'Conner said that there is gravel and they will not be changing any of added that they are adding impervious surface in between the house and the garage where it is currently concrete. She said there is currently a pipe that was installed underneath the concrete and piping out towards the back of the property. She said the homeowner will be maintaining their own drainage and fixing the issues with the landscape architect.

Ms. Montgomery asked if they will need a French drain between the back of the property before getting to Hardware Alley.

Mr. Pohlman reminded Commission members that stormwater is outside of the Commission's purview.

Ms. Rowe said that it is an improvement and said if this is within all the guidelines, she approves.

Ms. Wilson stated that she echoes Ms. Rowe's statement and said it looks great.

Ms. Dovre said that it also has her approval.

Mr. Pohlman stated that this is conceptual and lacking details.

4. [304 King Street](#) – **HISTORIC 6125** – (TMS 532-01-00-041) Final Review for Installation of Railings and Reroofing

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Barbara Wagoner, property owner stated that she needs a new roof and railings down the front steps.

Ms. Montgomery said that she would prefer the wrought iron rails.

Ms. Wagoner felt that if she brought white wood railings down, it would add an architectural element that was not needed.

Ms. Wilson stated that she prefers that it match the railing of the house. She said typically, the railing continues to become a hand rail, or at least the white element to a post. She does not have an issue with the roof.

Ms. Rowe asked if there was any objection to continuing the white.

Ms. Wagoner said that the front yard is very small, and she would prefer the wrought iron, because it disappears.

Ms. Wilson asked if she was proposing a wrought iron railing without any pickets, just a handrail.

Mr. Wagoner responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Pohlman stated that there is one additional item he neglected to put into the staff report. He said that Ms. Wagoner would also like to continue the stubbed-out column to the top of the porch.

Ms. Wilson asked how old the house is.

Ms. Wagoner said that it was built in 1890. She said it was moved to 311 Venning in the 1930's.

Ms. Wilson said that the columns are likely out, because if you look at the spacing of the existing columns it would be too tight. She said the roof is already asphalt shingles; however, she would prefer the white wood railing.

Ms. Rowe agreed.

Ms. Wilson said the turn of the century would not have had the rod iron railing.

Ms. Wagoner said if the porch was added when the house was moved in the 1930's, it is truly not a turn of the century porch.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if Ms. Wagoner was agreeable to a wood railing.

Ms. Wagoner said she was. She said with the porch only being 26 inches off the ground.

Ms. Wilson stated that Ms. Wagoner does not need to do pickets and will only be required to do a thin simple wood railing, because she does not have a code issue.

Ms. Wagoner stated that it is only an insurance issue for her.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if Ms. Wagoner would have to come back before the Commission.

Ms. Wilson stated that she believes the Commission can approve a wood rail.

Ms. Wagoner asked if this is a wood railing without pickets, and the top of the rail is white.

Ms. Wilson stated that if you go back to the front elevation, there is the half newel post, you would simply match the one on the left. She said you would have two of those and the top and bottom rails would match, but would not need the pickets.

Ms. Wagoner stated that she may put the railings on both sides or possibly just on one side.

Ms. Wilson asked Mr. Juan if she only needed a grab rail on one side, because it is such a narrow step.

Mr. Juan responded in the affirmative.

Ms. Wagoner asked if it would need to be on the right or left.

Ms. Wilson stated that the left would be preferable, because the short newel post is there, and it goes to another newel.

Ms. Wagoner stated that this is what she will have done.

Ms. Wilson moved to approve the work to be done on 304 King Street, to include the roof and the railing to be wood with dimensions matching existing porch railing; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

5. [305 McCormack Street](#) – Survey 4216 – (TMS 532-09-00-068) Final Review for Addition

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

(Ms. Rowe exited the meeting at 5:33 p.m. and returned at 5:36 p.m.)

Linda Balzac, architect representing the owner, Sam and Judy Lisi. She said she found in her archives the original time when this was approved in May of 2012. She stated that they are removing the back deck of the house and expanding the family room inside. She said the Lisi's now have a number of grandchildren and need more space. She said they are following the existing lines of the sides of the house and matching the materials. She said they do have a small grilling deck off the back right side with steps to the yard and a reconfigured deck on the left side of the house. There is a covered piece of deck and they are going to square off and go into the back yard. She said they are removing the shed because it is a store-bought fiberglass shed on concrete block, so it will be moved rather than demolished in order to stay under the 40% rule. She said everything will match existing and is not very visible from the street and is in keeping with the style of the house and the original addition she did a number of years ago.

Sam Lisi, homeowner, said that they would like to use artisan Hardie in the back, as opposed to wood. They are using wood trim, but artisan siding.

Ms. Wilson moved to approve the plans at 305 McCormack Street as submitted; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

Ms. Wilson amended her motion to include the material for hardie in the rear addition; Ms. Montgomery amended her second. All present voted in favor.

6. [720 Pitt Street](#) – **HISTORIC 5954** – (TMS 517-15-00-028) Conceptual Comment for Additions and Alterations

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Elizabeth Drake, architect for the homeowners, stated that she listened to Commission members at the last meeting. She said they are removing the screened porch and the clients would like to have a cabana separate from the main house, as well as a raised pool. She said they did get the spot elevations which are shown. She said the lot is low and backs up onto the Ben Tatum pond. They originally had the deck surrounding the pool at the height of the house. She said they have the whole raised deck dropped approximately 15 inches and made the pool narrower by approximately 12 inches. She said by having you step directly out of the house, it reduced the amount of decking that was needed, so she pulled the structure closer to the house by approximately 42 inches. She went to a gable, as opposed to the hip and was trying to keep the roof low with the hip, but it was not in keeping with the house. She said they designed the fireplace, so you are not able to see it when looking down the driveway. She said they put it at the back of the property. She said on the left side, she had the stairs at the edge of the setback; however, she pulled the stairs away from the setback and will have some planting as you step down. She said the terraces are trying to keep the appearance of railing to a minimum and will need to be worked out more. She said she would like to look more at the massing because they are limited as to the size of the deck, but not make a raised pool with a lot of railings, which is what the terracing and landscaping is. She said in the last presentation, she was not clear that the owners were requesting privacy; therefore, they are requesting that the cabana have louvered shutters that are operable. She said this would provide privacy. She also cleaned up the golf cart and garage storage as well.

Ms. Montgomery stated that when she previously served on this Commission, there were negative feelings towards Bermuda shutters. She asked if there is an alternate shutter or has there been a change in the Commission's position.

Ms. Wilson asked if the shutters tilted out or hinge open.

Ms. Drake stated that that they tilt out which would provide the most privacy; however, there are those that pivot. She said that they are open to comments on this.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the last iteration of the Commission on Bermuda shutters was they would be acceptable if they were fixed.

Ms. Wilson asked why they would use a louvered shutter with the hinging at the top. She said if they are hinged, you would have just as much privacy when closed, but would also have the ability to open them. She said the look is the same when closed.

Ms. Rowe stated that Ms. Drake did everything that the Commission requested, and it looks very nice.

Mr. Pohlman stated that in the guidelines, under Doors and Windows, it states, *“do not install new shutters that are clearly out of keeping with the building’s character. This includes shutters of the wrong size or architectural style for the house. When closed, shutter should cover the window completely, without overlapping each other on the wall surfaces. On historic buildings, window shutters must be operational rather than fixed.”* He stated that this would be the only guideline regarding Bermuda shutters, which would be if the Commission felt that it was the wrong size or architectural style for the house.

Ms. Wilson said a louvered shutter goes more with the house, as well as the ability to open it. She asked if there was a reason why Ms. Drake did not match the soffit and detail of the house. She said that it is the only thing with a traditional gable open rafter, whereas everything else has the Queen Ann return on the house and there are a lot of them, so it is a very strong vocabulary for the house. She asked if Ms. Drake was going to screen under the cabana, so whatever is put under will be screened.

Ms. Drake said that there will not be any screening.

Ms. Wilson said under the house, what is put in between the piers, is there going to be wood.

Ms. Drake said she has not intended to do so. She said that they have not considered that portion yet and thought they would louver around the pool but leave underneath the house open.

Ms. Wilson said that the massing looks good and the relationship with the house is much better, which is why she is looking at the smaller details. She said she feels very good about the massing. She asked Ms. Drake to put the dimension from the rear property line when she returns. She said that the eave detail should match as it is a house with a really strong gable vocabulary and the only gable that would stand out. She said Ms. Drake has done everything else to knit it together.

Ms. Drake asked if Ms. Wilson would like for her to take the siding horizontal as well.

Ms. Wilson responded in the negative. She said under the house should be concealed so at the very least, the area that faces Pitt Street should be screened.

Mr. Hirshorn said that the view from Royall Avenue is also prominent and suggested that Ms. Drake screen the entire area under the house.

Ms. Drake said that she likes the elevation looking back from there. She said she was trying to design the cabana differently without the return; however, understands it is needed. She said on the backside, she changed the overhang. Originally where the screened porch is, it came down to a slope, she was making the eaves line up between the two and bringing it down to a more severe fascia soffit to give it an edge, but it is not something that goes with the rest of the house.

Ms. Wilson stated that if Ms. Drake does this, it will require a column on the outside corner where it turns, because it is a massive overhang to wrap the house. She said she is not sure how it is totally going to get attached to the house.

Ms. Dovre said that she was also thinking of a column for the connection, but other than that, she believes Ms. Drake has done everything in compliance.

Ms. Drake said that she would review this, because it is open, so she may change it up, but it does need a column.

Ms. Wilson asked if Ms. Drake was trying to get it covered into the entry.

Ms. Drake said she liked the way it wrapped and brought the house around.

Ms. Wilson said that she likes it on the back covering the exit out to the pool more.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if there is any comment on the subject of elevated pool decks. He said the application for an elevated pool, a concession was made because it was secluded and not in view of the right of way.

Mr. Pohlman added that it was also because the slope of the lot decreased significantly.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that this is a similar lot situation; however, the exception is that the pool deck is clearly visible from Royall Avenue across the lake.

Ms. Wilson stated that the Commission is not able to comment on landscaping; however, when landscaped it will be more buffered and the pool will be screened. She said that she is advocating for this project, because she is in favor of the greenspace being preserved. She said it is a deep lot and there is a large greenspace area in the rear that backs up to Ben Tatum pond. She lives two lots away so she understands how wet it is in the back. She said at the very least, it would have to be a partially raised pool.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that he understands that landscaping is not the purview of the Commission, but he would still like to see some preliminary landscaping.

Mr. Pohlman stated that this is outside the Commission's purview and would not be advisable to request.

Ms. Montgomery stated that the homeowner will no doubt use some type of landscaping, because it will be very visible.

Mr. Pohlman stated that the homeowners are proposing planters and asked if Mr. Juan would provide building code guidance on how far the planters must be for height to get around the railing.

Mr. Juan stated that it is 30 inches.

Mr. Pohlman said that if the homeowners install 30-inch planter beds, they will be able to get around the railing restriction around the pool. He said they would be planter beds, which is a structure.

Ms. Drake stated that she has one planter bed and there is still some work to be done. She stated that she is attempting to wrap the lower bed all the way, which reduces the height of the cabana. She said once it is constructed, she believes the homeowners will plant some landscaping at the back of the property.

John Dukes, homeowner, stated that they absolutely want to landscape the back for privacy, as well as the fence.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the elevated pools/decks are not something the Commission wants to see all around unless there were specific reasons. He said he would like to know if the pool is going to be shielded.

Ms. Wilson stated that she believes these requests can be handled on a case by case basis. She said they are fortunate that their lot is deep and are able to provide screened space to buffer it.

Ms. Montgomery said the area underneath the pool would be a great place for bicycles and other items.

Ms. Drake said that on one side, there will be some type of opening.

Mr. Dukes anticipated it being enclosed to hide any pool equipment.

Ms. Drake said there is storage elsewhere and under the cabana.

Mr. Hirshorn said he believes the architect and homeowner have received good comments.

7. [625 Royall Avenue](#) – Survey 5993 – (TMS) Final Review for New Construction

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Phil Clarke – Clarke Design Group, stated that they did remove the pool from the plans. He said the last comments made by the Commission was to increase the porch visibility in size and width and soften the exterior from the street. He said the mud room was pulled in closer and they removed the steps off the back. He said in the garage, they added a side piece for a covered outdoor pit/shed area. He said nothing will be stored there and it will not be similar to a carport but is meant to be a covered outdoor space. He said the porch now wraps around and ties in with the mud room. He said before it stopped at the two windows. He said he took into account the slope of the lot as it goes down towards the pond and

are still okay on the height. He said it was originally a raised house when first proposed and there was a small hitch in the rear of the gable, which has been cleaned up and now a simpler gable instead of kicking out on a separate pitch.

Mr. Hirshorn asked if there were also comments on the left elevation.

Ms. Wilson stated that the Commission asked for a complete gable and the corner board was not put in, but it is still a major improvement, but not 100% what the Commission asked. She said you would have had a corner board and then the perpendicular gable would have been in a different plane.

Ms. Montgomery stated that on the left elevation, there is a large blank area with the large gable. She asked if there was a bedroom behind that area.

Mr. Clarke stated that the space was for the bathrooms and closets; however, if the Commission would prefer he add a window, he can revise the bathroom layout and install a window.

Ms. Rowe stated that she loves the front elevation and agrees with Ms. Montgomery on the left side.

Ms. Wilson said that she would still like to see the complete gable and have the other piece push off slightly. She said that it is a really big wall and would suggest three windows in addition to an attic window. She said she does not know at what point the Commission is asking too much to be approved with comment. She said the front looks great and appreciates the porch wrapping around. She said she still really likes the back. She said there is some empty real estate in the gable on the right elevation, which is a lot of wall space. She said this wan can have more windows or shutters off to the side to give it more attention on the two sides.

Ms. Dovre said it will look great on this property.

Mr. Clarke stated that in response to Ms. Wilson, on the left elevation, the dining and bedroom piece, what he hears is to shift it over four inches just enough to give a corner board and get that break. He said if the Commission will approve the project with the comment of creating a four-inch step in that piece, he will be happy to do so.

Ms. Wilson thinks that a four-inch shift in a corner board and symmetrical window and an attic window as long as they are in line with other windows and at Mr. Clarke's discretion, three more windows, it just needs more. She said that this relief and a corner board, because it is an exposed side of the house especially with the driveway on it, so it will be seen from the street and will be a bleak angle view down the driveway. She said she would trust Mr. Clarke to implement these changes.

Mr. Hirshorn said that he would assume the right elevation as well.

Ms. Wilson said even an attic louver or another fixed window, because it is a big space up there. She said the right side is a little different, because it is not the driveway side and will not have as much public view and there is the lower piece of pushing the gable, which is misleading, because it is further back. She said if Mr. Clarke filled the gable on both sides and added three windows on the left elevation and put the corner in relief, she would be more satisfied.

Ms. Wilson asked about the depth of the front porch.

Mr. Clarke said it is eight feet.

Mr. Hirshorn said that it appears the issues are the left and right-side elevations with more detail.

Mr. Pohlman stated that with Ms. Wilson's specific comments, he can review this at staff level, if the Commission approves it.

Ms. Montgomery asked about triangular vents at the gable that are so traditional. Ms. Wilson said that Mr. Clarke is going to add gable vents.

Ms. Wilson moved to approve the residence at 625 Royall Avenue with the following additions: the dining wing at the rear will be pushed 4 to 6 inches at a plane with the main gable, 3 windows will be added to the left side, which will be the size and in line of existing windows in the plan and gable vents on both gables on the left and right sides, centered; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

8. [200 Queen Street](#) – Survey 6091 – (TMS 532-05-00-025) Conceptual Comment on Additions and Alterations

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Hans Altenbach, architect for the homeowners, the Spicer's, would like to present the plans. He said that there are eight houses in that section of Queen Street, five two-story homes and three one and a half story houses. 200 Queen Street is one of the one and a half story houses and the Spicer's would like to take it to a full two-story house. He said the houses are all AE13, with the exception of 200 Queen Street and the one adjacent to it facing the harbor. He said 200 Queen is the only house that has eight-foot parking underneath.

Ms. Wilson stated that they need assistance understanding the addition to the house more than the site.

Mr. Altenbach said he understood there was concern on the height of the house. He stated that the first floor is nine feet and is proposing a nine foot second floor. He said the house footprint is the existing wood pile foundation which is the basis of the footprint of the house. He said the plan is to reuse the wood pile foundation as well as the exterior walls. He said it is a U-shaped house and there is a central deck in the middle of the house that they would like to fill in and make it condition space and bring the house together for an interior floor plan. He said it is currently a two-bedroom, two bath home and are looking to make it a four-bedroom, three bath home. He said they have to follow the footprint of what is already existing. He said structurally, it is a wood pile house and cannot put any foundation system in. He said it would be a new construction home and no semblance left of what the original house was.

Ms. Montgomery said that the house that was there was destroyed in Hugo and this house was built to be that high. She said it is on wood pilings and asked if it is sufficient for the weight that is going on it.

Mr. Altenbach responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Juan stated that he is unsure and would have to review further.

Mr. Altenbach said that they have had it evaluated with soil testing.

Ms. Rowe stated that she is concerned that it is not harmonious with the neighborhood. She said the west elevation, the spiral staircase is what you will see from the harbor, as well as from the south elevation. She said there is a great deal of real estate on the north elevation with the small window.

Ms. Wilson stated that one thing the Commission asked for previously was to see existing and proposed on the same piece of paper stacked.

Mr. Pohlman said that what he has is not a detailed elevation but showed the massing of the current home.

Ms. Wilson said that she understands there are different grades; however, when you look down Queen Street now the house that is there is an appropriate size and approximately the same as the house on the left at the of the street. She understands that they would like to put in a second floor, it needs to be conceived with dormers or the roof needs to be brought down. She said the house already has an extra floor by having a raised house, so with a second story, it is really a three-story house. She said there are a lot of smaller structures on Queen Street. She stated that the front is the harbor which is how it is considered in the Old Village; therefore, it needs to have a front elevation approach. Her other concerns are the rooflines in general and does not completely understand the roof. She said there are gables, then hips and they are all at different pitches. She said the design is lacking a scheme and she is not able to tell what style the home is. She said there is not really a front elevation. She said the existing house has a very identifiable character that is understood on all sides; however, the proposed home appears to be a different home on each side and it is too tall. She understands that it needs to be bigger and the homeowners are limited in their footprint but believes they can get more space on the second floor without making it as monolithic as the proposed home. She said the marsh / harbor side needs to look like the front of the house.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the issues appear to not only be the standalone scale of the house, but relative to the streetscape, which is an important aspect of what the Commission reviews, whether it conforms with the street in the particular block the house sits on. Also, being so prominent on the harbor with so few harbor homes remaining. He said the Commission takes a very detailed look at the design elements and believes there is a great deal to rework on the house. He said this is important feedback in order to streamline the approval process in order not to be required to return multiple times with the same issues. He stated that he has a comment on the solar panels as well. He met with a solar power company in the neighborhood and said in order to sufficiently

power this home, a number of large panels would be needed, and they would all be very visible. He said while we all appreciate solar efficiency, in this particular case, a harbor front home in the Old Village is likely not going to be the first test case unless he is able to see something different. He said as a design element, it will be difficult.

Ms. Rowe said she mentioned this at the previous meeting, that she would not be in favor of the solar panels at this time.

Ms. Wilson said that she would not say she is against solar panels; however, the roof plan, aesthetically, needs to be agreed upon first, then the plan can provide an area on the roof that is flat and not visible and large enough to do a measurable amount of solar panels. She added that the tree canopy will also not be favorable to solar panels.

Ms. Montgomery stated that she is not in favor of the west elevation due to the spiral staircase being so visible.

Dr. Ken Spicer, homeowner, said he is here with his wife, Pat. He said they had Coastal Engineering do the soil testing and learned over the last 16 years, it has changed the substructure of the soil considerably. He said the large oak tree in the front lived through Hugo and feels that it will be there for many more years. Much of the roof design is strictly there to allow them to install 32 to 40 solar panels and much of the gabling and slant of the roof is designed to make this completely invisible from the street or harbor. He said the spiral stairs were proposed in order to access the solar panels for maintenance.

Mr. Altenbach said that he has not updated the 3D model and what is showing is not what is being proposed. He said they did simplify the roofline on the back of the house which mimics the next-door neighbor's house. The neighbor has the Charleston style gable and faces the harbor. He said they have the Charleston style gable with the double porch and have proposed this concept on a raised house.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the Commission's comments appear to be that the height and scale relative to the Queen Street block needs to be reworked. He said the rooflines, particularly if the Commission is not allowing extensive solar paneling, need to be reviewed, and the spiral staircase is not favorable.

Mr. Altenbach asked about the maximum height he is allowed on this street.

Ms. Wilson said if Mr. Altenbach looks at the ridge of the current structure, this is close to the height. She said this is why the Commission needs to review the front elevations, existing and proposed, and the amount of vertical wall is more than doubling compared to the neighbors' houses. She said it has a symmetrical presence and is addressing the harbor, which has been lost in the proposed design. She said she would consider dormers and one and a half story elements and not all the same height, so it can step down towards the harbor, towards the street and porches. She said it is asking a lot of the footprint. She said that the design has gone straight up, and it is too much for the street, the lot and the house. She said the Commission's job is to look at the whole streetscape. She said some residents have lived there for their whole lives and all the Commission is able to respond to is what is physically there. She said it is not the Commission's job, nor are they able to comment whether the neighbors' homes are flood compliant. She said they are not asking to do anything to their houses.

Mr. Altenbach asked if non-flood compliant homes should dictate what a compliant home should do.

Ms. Wilson said unfortunately yes, in a historic neighborhood. She said the streetscape is what the Commission is protecting, not just individual homes. She said there are ways to accomplish both. She said there are ways to get a second story with knee walls and dormers and different roof pitches and stepping down, and porches that address both the street and the harbor. She said the privilege of living on the harbor comes at a price where you have two fronts; the approach and the harbor.

Mr. Altenbach asked if the Commission would take the fabric screen out of the back of the house.

Ms. Wilson said that she would take it out to present to the Commission, because she is not able to determine what is going on in the elevations.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the feedback is a restudy of the project, considering all the comments. He said that it would be more prudent to do a restudy of the project.

Ms. Wilson said that the project needs a concept and it is difficult to know where you are in the house relative to the site and in a neighborhood like this, it should link into the streetscape and should have a feeling to it. She added that it has different styles on all sides, but the Commission would be looking for something that connects in a meaningful way to both the streetscape and harborscape.

Dr. Spicer stated that they changed the Pitt Street side or the east side and did away with the door to make the front the harborside. He said since that time, he spoke to his neighbors who indicated that they regret removing their east side doorway, because everyone comes through the backdoor. They indicated that no one uses the harborside entrance. He asked if the Commission was against having a door on the backside, or Pitt Street side of the home.

Ms. Wilson said that the Commission is not being that literal. She said it is making a welcoming front to both the street and harbor. She said it is stepping down to the street, a porch or lower one-story element. She said it needs to make accommodation for the fact that it is on a street with smaller houses. She understands that they would like to step up to the harbor with the big views, which is obviously understandable. She said there is a tremendous amount of space underneath the ridge of the existing structure. She said there is a lot to be done without having a home so massive.

Dr. Spicer said if on the Pitt Street side, the Commission would like to see less bulk and size, that would be more appealing and the harborside is not quite so much of a concern in terms of size, because both neighbors are taller than his house. He asked if the Commission was strictly against solar panels.

Ms. Wilson stated that it is a difficult situation, because the Commission's job is to ensure the house works in the neighborhood and in doing so, this house cannot have a massive roof like what is being proposed. She said building up a house to accommodate the solar panels is not an approach that the Commission will support. She said if Dr. Spicer is able to propose a house that the Commission is able to support, and in that house, it also accommodates solar panels, then it will be supported. She said that the house design must come first.

Dr. Spicer said until the solar panel shingles come to the market.

Mr. Hirshorn stated that the Commission looks forward to seeing the next design and added that the harbor front homes are scrutinized closely, because there are so few of them left.

9. [221 Queen Street](#) – Survey 6097 – (TMS 532-05-00-029) Final Review for Installation of Hot Tub.

Mr. Pohlman reviewed staff comments with the Commission.

Ernie Mellin, representing the owners, Sandra and Larry Hudson.

Ms. Wilson stated that she cannot understand where it is going to be on the property.

Mr. Mellin said that it will be on the new detached garage patio.

Ms. Wilson asked if it is proposed to be flush in the ground.

Mr. Mellin said that it is an above ground, self-contained hot tub unit on the patio, underneath the roof.

Ms. Rowe asked if it would be visible from the street.

Mr. Mellin responded in the negative.

Ms. Rowe asked if it would be visible to the neighbors.

Mr. Mellin said that it would be in the back; however, the owners would be installing a screen.

Mr. Hirshorn said the idea of the hot tub is not necessarily something the Commission is against but would need to be assured that the hot tub is not going to be visible from the street or the neighbors.

Ms. Wilson said she knows the neighbors on either side of this house and they would absolutely be able to see the hot tub, which would set a dangerous precedent to have a raised hot tub on a patio. She said she would need to see a compelling design or the way it is built or flush into the ground before she would be in favor.

Mr. Mellin asked if screening it would be favorable.

Ms. Wilson said that she would have to see a drawn design first. She said if the porch were enclosed, possibly.

Ms. Dovre said she would consider it if it was enclosed on the porch, but that would require the applicant coming back and reapplying.

Mr. Hirshorn said that the Commission would have to see a design. He said if the hot tub is something the applicant is interested in, the Commission would have to see some type of enclosure, because it is too visible. He said possibly a new application if the homeowners would like to design an enclosure to hide the hot tub from the street and neighbors.

Ms. Dovre said where the hot tub is proposed on the back wall of the neighbor, asked if it would be enclosed with louvers.

Ms. Wilson said it might help, but she would like to see something drawn to scale, along with the elevations to understand it. She said it is a unique lot, because it is not very big and exposed to neighbors on two sides and from the side yard, is exposed to Queen Street.

Mr. Mellin said that he will work on some type of screening and bring it back.

Ms. Montgomery suggested a louvered screening.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to defer the application at 221 Queen Street, until a more detailed description is provided; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

[108 Carr Street](#) – Survey 6269 – (TMS 532-05-00-057) Final Review for Accessory Structure and Addition

This item was moved from item #1 on the agenda to the last item.

Ms. Wilson moved to defer 108 Carr Street to the March 13, 2018 meeting when the applicant can be present; seconded by Ms. Montgomery. All present voted in favor.

IV. Staff Approvals

Mr. Pohlman stated that there was one staff approval for a re-roofing at 5 Pierates Cruz, and they are going back in with new architectural shingle. He said it is a non- historic home.

V. Motion to Adjourn

Ms. Wilson made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Ms. Rowe. All present voted in favor.

There being no further business, meeting adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Ashe

February 12, 2018